

REMARKS

Claims 5-12 are pending in the present application. Claims 8, 11 and 12 are allowed. Claims 5 and 6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,247,082 to Lo et al., ("Lo") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,032,078 to Bacigalupo et al., ("Bacigalupo"). Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo in view of Bacigalupo in further view in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,528,215 to Siu et al., ("Siu"). Claims 9 and 10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo in view of Bacigalupo in further view in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,443. to Gulick et al., ("Gulick").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections to Independent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Independent claim 5 of the present application recites, among other features, a master device and slave device with respective first and second arithmetic units and "an acknowledgment signal line configured for a transmission of an acknowledgment signal from the slave device to the master device" wherein "the first arithmetic unit is configured so that a capability of the master device to initiate a further write operation to the slave device is dependent upon a receiving of the acknowledge signal from the slave device."

It is respectfully submitted that Lo and Bacigalupo do not teach or suggest those features of claim 5. On the one hand, the Examiner admits that Lo does not disclose the claimed "acknowledgement signal from the slave device to the master device." On the other hand, the Examiner states that "the ready signals and the acknowledgement pulses (of Lo) is also being interpreted as an acknowledgment signal." *See*, Detailed Action, page 4, lines 15-17. However, the Examiner's "interpreted" acknowledgement signal is not the claimed acknowledgement signal because it is not from the slave device to the master device as recited in claim 5. Thus, Lo does not disclose the recited feature of "a capability of the master device to initiate a further write operation to the slave device is dependent upon a receiving of the acknowledgement signal," wherein the acknowledgement signal is the claimed "acknowledgement signal from the slave device to the master device."

Bacigalupo also does not disclose that "a capability of the master device to initiate a further write operation to the slave device is dependent upon a receiving of the

acknowledgement signal.” Instead, as explained in detail on page 7 of the response dated December 13, 2006, Bacigalupo describes that “the receiving master unit 1 uses the ACK signal to acknowledge that the data or error states signals have been received correctly.” However, Bacigalupo does not disclose that a further write operation is dependent upon receiving the described ACK signal.

Nor is there any suggestion or motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. For example, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious that the master and slave interfaces are capable of being connected via a clock signal line “to enable more flexible data transmission” (See page 4). However, the master and slave computer subsystems of Lo, each have their own clock domain operating at different clock rates. The purpose of the Lo invention is to include “a handshake circuit coupled between the first and second domains for providing the required handshaking signals to control the transfer of data between the first domain (master) and the second domain (slave)” (Lo, Abstract). Thus, directly connecting the master and slave clock domains as suggested by the Examiner would frustrate the purpose of the Lo invention – i.e. disposing a handshaking circuit between the two different clock domains.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Rejections to claims 7, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7, 9 and 10 depend from claim 5. The additional references used in the rejection of claim 7 and the rejection of claims 9 and 10, namely Sui and Gulick respectively, do not describe the features lacking in Lo and Bacigalupo. Further, the Examiner has not addressed the remarks presented in the response dated December 13, 2006 with respect to claims 9 and 10. Specifically, the Examiner did not address the evidence that Gulick teaches away from the claimed invention. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 7, 9 and 10 are respectfully requested.

